

Newspaper page with multiple columns of text, including news articles, advertisements, and a large illustration of a woman's face at the bottom right.

TUESDAY MORNING, MARCH 1, 1891.

ANOTHER METHOD PROPOSED.

Every observer and thinker has taken notice of the absurdity of the method of the constitution for electing the president and vice president of the United States. That method was adopted as a theory which has utterly failed in practice. Party usage has completely defeated it. The electoral college of a state was intended to be not a deliberative body, but a mere body capable of making a choice. But party conventions have changed it into a deliberative body. The electors now vote only for the persons named by the party conventions. Everything else is left to chance. No method is prescribed for testing the legality of election of electors. The state is thus left to the mercy of the party conventions. They prescribe each for itself the manner in which the electors are to be appointed. The usual way is to elect the whole number to which each state is entitled on a general ticket. There is no propriety in this since each state is allowed a number of electors equal to the number of its representatives and senators in congress. The fact is obviously wrong to divide the state into as many electoral districts as it may have representatives, and elect two only on a ticket to be voted by the whole people of the state. Senator Wallace of Pennsylvania, has lately proposed an amendment to the constitution providing a new method of electing the president and vice president, which has merit. It proposes that each state shall be divided immediately after each census is taken into as many electoral districts as the state under the apportionment has representatives and senators, that in each district an elector shall be voted for by the people on having the greatest number of votes to be elected no matter if it is not a majority, that the final canvass of the district votes shall be made in each state by the governor, chief justice and secretary of state who shall certify the result to the senators of the state and to the president of the senate, and this certificate shall be final and conclusive upon congress. Finally the certificates shall be opened and the votes counted in joint session, and the persons having the largest number of electoral votes shall be declared elected, no matter if they have not a majority.

It is apparent that this method would eliminate many sources of trouble and dispute. It would leave to the states, each for itself, to provide for a legal method of testing the legality of the election of electors where there is a dispute, and make the state's certificate final, so that there would be no further system no further talk about congress rejecting electoral votes. It would give the people greater power over the choice of a president and make possible the combinations and coalitions in close states, by which there are sometimes carried nowadays when electors are chosen on a general ticket. Finally it would prevent any possibility of having the election thrown into the house of representatives because a plurality of the electoral votes is cast.

The objection to it is that it would still retain the electoral college which experience has proven to be a cumbersome and absurd piece of machinery that can no longer answer the end for which it was created. But either the electoral college must be retained or we must elect by a direct vote of the people. This last is not likely to be considered favorably so long as it is apparent that in many states of the union large parts of the popular vote is deliberately suppressed and overwhelming majorities made for a particular party. Had the election of 1880 depended on the popular vote there would have been immense fraudulent majorities in many states, completely overturning the opposing honest majorities in others. The electoral college system with all its imperfections, has averted this result.

A SUBSTITUTE FOR STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.

The action of the senate a short time since in so positively rejecting the bill for subsidies to steamship lines renders it probable that the attempt to fast this system into the policy of the country can not be pushed to success, though doubtless the effort therefor will be renewed. Journals at New York and Chicago which oppose the subsidy system refer to local taxation as one of the crushing disadvantages under which the American marine labors. A wooden sailing vessel, built to carry grain through the Welland canal, would cost \$20,000. This vessel if owned in Chicago, would be assessed by the local authorities at \$10,000 and the state and city tax on the vessel at 5 per cent the rate in Chicago, amounts to \$500. The same vessel under a British registry and owned at Liverpool, pays a tax of 1 per cent, not on any valuation, but on the net profits. As the average gross earnings of such a vessel in a year of good freight would be about \$12,000, and her expenses from a half to two thirds as much, the English tax is from \$40 to \$60 a difference between the tax in Chicago and Liverpool of over 2 per cent on the sum invested in the vessel, and 2 per cent is now, says one-half the secure return on a safe investment. Local taxation in New York is only one half that in Chicago, about 2 1/2, instead of 5 per cent, but the difference between the tax in New York and in Liverpool is still large enough to place the American ship owner at a serious disadvantage. The New York Commercial Bulletin puts the probable annual profit on an ocean steamship costing \$500,000, at \$25,000. The English tax on this is \$250. In New York city such a vessel will be assessed at about 60 per cent, on her value, just as real estate is. She will therefore pay 2 1/2 per cent on an assessment of \$800,000, or \$10,250, 42 per cent, on the average profit of \$25,000, which can safely be counted on the original investment. There are other disadvantages under which American vessels labor, growing out of the higher wages of American seamen and the special privileges given sailors by American laws; but these can be less easily estimated. Many of them would disappear under the competition of a growing marine, but the pressure of local taxation is an unvarying factor whose real influence can be fairly measured only when the ship markets of the world are open to American buyers, but which stands an unquestioned and serious bar to the growth of an American marine. I have been customary, as the Chicago Times is now doing, to urge on state legislatures a general exemption from local taxes on ocean-going steamships, but the subject is a matter which lies well within the power of congress to regulate foreign commerce. We agree with the Springfield Republican that if the federal government is to act at all to aid American shipbuilding it ought to be not by a subsidy, for which there is no excuse, but by exempting ocean vessels from local taxation. This is the usual and familiar expedient which many small town practices successfully to encourage coveted manufactures. It has every possible advantage over subsidies and in the present condition of the American marine it would exempt but little property now paying taxes.

Monitor look leave of President-elect Garfield yesterday, and this morning he will arrive in Washington. But we are not to suppose from the touching farewell tendered him by his neighbors that they, as true Ohio men, are sorry he is elected to the presidency.

A great deal has been said about the treatment which the Freed Indians have received at the hands of the government. Senator Dawes of Massachusetts is among those who have been talking about it—and he doubtless wishes to hear it. He recently delivered a speech in the senate on the subject in the course of which he reflected severely on Secretary Schurz. Now Mr. Schurz is a man whom it would be prudent to praise when one is on the year in the year contest. In defense of himself Mr. Schurz addressed Mr. Dawes in an extremely candid open letter, of which we had a summary by telegraph a fortnight ago. Mr. Dawes had laid at the door of Mr. Schurz the responsibility of the murder of Big Six, the Pon chief whom a soldier of the regular army had killed as he appeared, without justification. Mr. Schurz, in his reply, after stating that a call for officers has no voice on the floor of the senate and can not defend himself there against any attack, however unjust but that he has a right to employ those means of public defense which every citizen has at his disposal, proceeded to say:

Nobody could really suppose without receiving the impression that you mean to hold this department of the government responsible for the murder of Big Six, an incident in an expedition sent to land on the coast of the Pacific, and to divide the state into as many electoral districts as it may have representatives, and elect two only on a ticket to be voted by the whole people of the state. Senator Wallace of Pennsylvania, has lately proposed an amendment to the constitution providing a new method of electing the president and vice president, which has merit. It proposes that each state shall be divided immediately after each census is taken into as many electoral districts as the state under the apportionment has representatives and senators, that in each district an elector shall be voted for by the people on having the greatest number of votes to be elected no matter if it is not a majority, that the final canvass of the district votes shall be made in each state by the governor, chief justice and secretary of state who shall certify the result to the senators of the state and to the president of the senate, and this certificate shall be final and conclusive upon congress. Finally the certificates shall be opened and the votes counted in joint session, and the persons having the largest number of electoral votes shall be declared elected, no matter if they have not a majority.

It is apparent that this method would eliminate many sources of trouble and dispute. It would leave to the states, each for itself, to provide for a legal method of testing the legality of the election of electors where there is a dispute, and make the state's certificate final, so that there would be no further system no further talk about congress rejecting electoral votes. It would give the people greater power over the choice of a president and make possible the combinations and coalitions in close states, by which there are sometimes carried nowadays when electors are chosen on a general ticket. Finally it would prevent any possibility of having the election thrown into the house of representatives because a plurality of the electoral votes is cast.

The objection to it is that it would still retain the electoral college which experience has proven to be a cumbersome and absurd piece of machinery that can no longer answer the end for which it was created. But either the electoral college must be retained or we must elect by a direct vote of the people. This last is not likely to be considered favorably so long as it is apparent that in many states of the union large parts of the popular vote is deliberately suppressed and overwhelming majorities made for a particular party. Had the election of 1880 depended on the popular vote there would have been immense fraudulent majorities in many states, completely overturning the opposing honest majorities in others. The electoral college system with all its imperfections, has averted this result.

The action of the senate a short time since in so positively rejecting the bill for subsidies to steamship lines renders it probable that the attempt to fast this system into the policy of the country can not be pushed to success, though doubtless the effort therefor will be renewed. Journals at New York and Chicago which oppose the subsidy system refer to local taxation as one of the crushing disadvantages under which the American marine labors. A wooden sailing vessel, built to carry grain through the Welland canal, would cost \$20,000. This vessel if owned in Chicago, would be assessed by the local authorities at \$10,000 and the state and city tax on the vessel at 5 per cent the rate in Chicago, amounts to \$500. The same vessel under a British registry and owned at Liverpool, pays a tax of 1 per cent, not on any valuation, but on the net profits. As the average gross earnings of such a vessel in a year of good freight would be about \$12,000, and her expenses from a half to two thirds as much, the English tax is from \$40 to \$60 a difference between the tax in Chicago and Liverpool of over 2 per cent on the sum invested in the vessel, and 2 per cent is now, says one-half the secure return on a safe investment. Local taxation in New York is only one half that in Chicago, about 2 1/2, instead of 5 per cent, but the difference between the tax in New York and in Liverpool is still large enough to place the American ship owner at a serious disadvantage. The New York Commercial Bulletin puts the probable annual profit on an ocean steamship costing \$500,000, at \$25,000. The English tax on this is \$250. In New York city such a vessel will be assessed at about 60 per cent, on her value, just as real estate is. She will therefore pay 2 1/2 per cent on an assessment of \$800,000, or \$10,250, 42 per cent, on the average profit of \$25,000, which can safely be counted on the original investment. There are other disadvantages under which American vessels labor, growing out of the higher wages of American seamen and the special privileges given sailors by American laws; but these can be less easily estimated. Many of them would disappear under the competition of a growing marine, but the pressure of local taxation is an unvarying factor whose real influence can be fairly measured only when the ship markets of the world are open to American buyers, but which stands an unquestioned and serious bar to the growth of an American marine. I have been customary, as the Chicago Times is now doing, to urge on state legislatures a general exemption from local taxes on ocean-going steamships, but the subject is a matter which lies well within the power of congress to regulate foreign commerce. We agree with the Springfield Republican that if the federal government is to act at all to aid American shipbuilding it ought to be not by a subsidy, for which there is no excuse, but by exempting ocean vessels from local taxation. This is the usual and familiar expedient which many small town practices successfully to encourage coveted manufactures. It has every possible advantage over subsidies and in the present condition of the American marine it would exempt but little property now paying taxes.

The action of the senate a short time since in so positively rejecting the bill for subsidies to steamship lines renders it probable that the attempt to fast this system into the policy of the country can not be pushed to success, though doubtless the effort therefor will be renewed. Journals at New York and Chicago which oppose the subsidy system refer to local taxation as one of the crushing disadvantages under which the American marine labors. A wooden sailing vessel, built to carry grain through the Welland canal, would cost \$20,000. This vessel if owned in Chicago, would be assessed by the local authorities at \$10,000 and the state and city tax on the vessel at 5 per cent the rate in Chicago, amounts to \$500. The same vessel under a British registry and owned at Liverpool, pays a tax of 1 per cent, not on any valuation, but on the net profits. As the average gross earnings of such a vessel in a year of good freight would be about \$12,000, and her expenses from a half to two thirds as much, the English tax is from \$40 to \$60 a difference between the tax in Chicago and Liverpool of over 2 per cent on the sum invested in the vessel, and 2 per cent is now, says one-half the secure return on a safe investment. Local taxation in New York is only one half that in Chicago, about 2 1/2, instead of 5 per cent, but the difference between the tax in New York and in Liverpool is still large enough to place the American ship owner at a serious disadvantage. The New York Commercial Bulletin puts the probable annual profit on an ocean steamship costing \$500,000, at \$25,000. The English tax on this is \$250. In New York city such a vessel will be assessed at about 60 per cent, on her value, just as real estate is. She will therefore pay 2 1/2 per cent on an assessment of \$800,000, or \$10,250, 42 per cent, on the average profit of \$25,000, which can safely be counted on the original investment. There are other disadvantages under which American vessels labor, growing out of the higher wages of American seamen and the special privileges given sailors by American laws; but these can be less easily estimated. Many of them would disappear under the competition of a growing marine, but the pressure of local taxation is an unvarying factor whose real influence can be fairly measured only when the ship markets of the world are open to American buyers, but which stands an unquestioned and serious bar to the growth of an American marine. I have been customary, as the Chicago Times is now doing, to urge on state legislatures a general exemption from local taxes on ocean-going steamships, but the subject is a matter which lies well within the power of congress to regulate foreign commerce. We agree with the Springfield Republican that if the federal government is to act at all to aid American shipbuilding it ought to be not by a subsidy, for which there is no excuse, but by exempting ocean vessels from local taxation. This is the usual and familiar expedient which many small town practices successfully to encourage coveted manufactures. It has every possible advantage over subsidies and in the present condition of the American marine it would exempt but little property now paying taxes.

A SUBSTITUTE FOR STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.

The action of the senate a short time since in so positively rejecting the bill for subsidies to steamship lines renders it probable that the attempt to fast this system into the policy of the country can not be pushed to success, though doubtless the effort therefor will be renewed. Journals at New York and Chicago which oppose the subsidy system refer to local taxation as one of the crushing disadvantages under which the American marine labors. A wooden sailing vessel, built to carry grain through the Welland canal, would cost \$20,000. This vessel if owned in Chicago, would be assessed by the local authorities at \$10,000 and the state and city tax on the vessel at 5 per cent the rate in Chicago, amounts to \$500. The same vessel under a British registry and owned at Liverpool, pays a tax of 1 per cent, not on any valuation, but on the net profits. As the average gross earnings of such a vessel in a year of good freight would be about \$12,000, and her expenses from a half to two thirds as much, the English tax is from \$40 to \$60 a difference between the tax in Chicago and Liverpool of over 2 per cent on the sum invested in the vessel, and 2 per cent is now, says one-half the secure return on a safe investment. Local taxation in New York is only one half that in Chicago, about 2 1/2, instead of 5 per cent, but the difference between the tax in New York and in Liverpool is still large enough to place the American ship owner at a serious disadvantage. The New York Commercial Bulletin puts the probable annual profit on an ocean steamship costing \$500,000, at \$25,000. The English tax on this is \$250. In New York city such a vessel will be assessed at about 60 per cent, on her value, just as real estate is. She will therefore pay 2 1/2 per cent on an assessment of \$800,000, or \$10,250, 42 per cent, on the average profit of \$25,000, which can safely be counted on the original investment. There are other disadvantages under which American vessels labor, growing out of the higher wages of American seamen and the special privileges given sailors by American laws; but these can be less easily estimated. Many of them would disappear under the competition of a growing marine, but the pressure of local taxation is an unvarying factor whose real influence can be fairly measured only when the ship markets of the world are open to American buyers, but which stands an unquestioned and serious bar to the growth of an American marine. I have been customary, as the Chicago Times is now doing, to urge on state legislatures a general exemption from local taxes on ocean-going steamships, but the subject is a matter which lies well within the power of congress to regulate foreign commerce. We agree with the Springfield Republican that if the federal government is to act at all to aid American shipbuilding it ought to be not by a subsidy, for which there is no excuse, but by exempting ocean vessels from local taxation. This is the usual and familiar expedient which many small town practices successfully to encourage coveted manufactures. It has every possible advantage over subsidies and in the present condition of the American marine it would exempt but little property now paying taxes.

The action of the senate a short time since in so positively rejecting the bill for subsidies to steamship lines renders it probable that the attempt to fast this system into the policy of the country can not be pushed to success, though doubtless the effort therefor will be renewed. Journals at New York and Chicago which oppose the subsidy system refer to local taxation as one of the crushing disadvantages under which the American marine labors. A wooden sailing vessel, built to carry grain through the Welland canal, would cost \$20,000. This vessel if owned in Chicago, would be assessed by the local authorities at \$10,000 and the state and city tax on the vessel at 5 per cent the rate in Chicago, amounts to \$500. The same vessel under a British registry and owned at Liverpool, pays a tax of 1 per cent, not on any valuation, but on the net profits. As the average gross earnings of such a vessel in a year of good freight would be about \$12,000, and her expenses from a half to two thirds as much, the English tax is from \$40 to \$60 a difference between the tax in Chicago and Liverpool of over 2 per cent on the sum invested in the vessel, and 2 per cent is now, says one-half the secure return on a safe investment. Local taxation in New York is only one half that in Chicago, about 2 1/2, instead of 5 per cent, but the difference between the tax in New York and in Liverpool is still large enough to place the American ship owner at a serious disadvantage. The New York Commercial Bulletin puts the probable annual profit on an ocean steamship costing \$500,000, at \$25,000. The English tax on this is \$250. In New York city such a vessel will be assessed at about 60 per cent, on her value, just as real estate is. She will therefore pay 2 1/2 per cent on an assessment of \$800,000, or \$10,250, 42 per cent, on the average profit of \$25,000, which can safely be counted on the original investment. There are other disadvantages under which American vessels labor, growing out of the higher wages of American seamen and the special privileges given sailors by American laws; but these can be less easily estimated. Many of them would disappear under the competition of a growing marine, but the pressure of local taxation is an unvarying factor whose real influence can be fairly measured only when the ship markets of the world are open to American buyers, but which stands an unquestioned and serious bar to the growth of an American marine. I have been customary, as the Chicago Times is now doing, to urge on state legislatures a general exemption from local taxes on ocean-going steamships, but the subject is a matter which lies well within the power of congress to regulate foreign commerce. We agree with the Springfield Republican that if the federal government is to act at all to aid American shipbuilding it ought to be not by a subsidy, for which there is no excuse, but by exempting ocean vessels from local taxation. This is the usual and familiar expedient which many small town practices successfully to encourage coveted manufactures. It has every possible advantage over subsidies and in the present condition of the American marine it would exempt but little property now paying taxes.

The action of the senate a short time since in so positively rejecting the bill for subsidies to steamship lines renders it probable that the attempt to fast this system into the policy of the country can not be pushed to success, though doubtless the effort therefor will be renewed. Journals at New York and Chicago which oppose the subsidy system refer to local taxation as one of the crushing disadvantages under which the American marine labors. A wooden sailing vessel, built to carry grain through the Welland canal, would cost \$20,000. This vessel if owned in Chicago, would be assessed by the local authorities at \$10,000 and the state and city tax on the vessel at 5 per cent the rate in Chicago, amounts to \$500. The same vessel under a British registry and owned at Liverpool, pays a tax of 1 per cent, not on any valuation, but on the net profits. As the average gross earnings of such a vessel in a year of good freight would be about \$12,000, and her expenses from a half to two thirds as much, the English tax is from \$40 to \$60 a difference between the tax in Chicago and Liverpool of over 2 per cent on the sum invested in the vessel, and 2 per cent is now, says one-half the secure return on a safe investment. Local taxation in New York is only one half that in Chicago, about 2 1/2, instead of 5 per cent, but the difference between the tax in New York and in Liverpool is still large enough to place the American ship owner at a serious disadvantage. The New York Commercial Bulletin puts the probable annual profit on an ocean steamship costing \$500,000, at \$25,000. The English tax on this is \$250. In New York city such a vessel will be assessed at about 60 per cent, on her value, just as real estate is. She will therefore pay 2 1/2 per cent on an assessment of \$800,000, or \$10,250, 42 per cent, on the average profit of \$25,000, which can safely be counted on the original investment. There are other disadvantages under which American vessels labor, growing out of the higher wages of American seamen and the special privileges given sailors by American laws; but these can be less easily estimated. Many of them would disappear under the competition of a growing marine, but the pressure of local taxation is an unvarying factor whose real influence can be fairly measured only when the ship markets of the world are open to American buyers, but which stands an unquestioned and serious bar to the growth of an American marine. I have been customary, as the Chicago Times is now doing, to urge on state legislatures a general exemption from local taxes on ocean-going steamships, but the subject is a matter which lies well within the power of congress to regulate foreign commerce. We agree with the Springfield Republican that if the federal government is to act at all to aid American shipbuilding it ought to be not by a subsidy, for which there is no excuse, but by exempting ocean vessels from local taxation. This is the usual and familiar expedient which many small town practices successfully to encourage coveted manufactures. It has every possible advantage over subsidies and in the present condition of the American marine it would exempt but little property now paying taxes.

The action of the senate a short time since in so positively rejecting the bill for subsidies to steamship lines renders it probable that the attempt to fast this system into the policy of the country can not be pushed to success, though doubtless the effort therefor will be renewed. Journals at New York and Chicago which oppose the subsidy system refer to local taxation as one of the crushing disadvantages under which the American marine labors. A wooden sailing vessel, built to carry grain through the Welland canal, would cost \$20,000. This vessel if owned in Chicago, would be assessed by the local authorities at \$10,000 and the state and city tax on the vessel at 5 per cent the rate in Chicago, amounts to \$500. The same vessel under a British registry and owned at Liverpool, pays a tax of 1 per cent, not on any valuation, but on the net profits. As the average gross earnings of such a vessel in a year of good freight would be about \$12,000, and her expenses from a half to two thirds as much, the English tax is from \$40 to \$60 a difference between the tax in Chicago and Liverpool of over 2 per cent on the sum invested in the vessel, and 2 per cent is now, says one-half the secure return on a safe investment. Local taxation in New York is only one half that in Chicago, about 2 1/2, instead of 5 per cent, but the difference between the tax in New York and in Liverpool is still large enough to place the American ship owner at a serious disadvantage. The New York Commercial Bulletin puts the probable annual profit on an ocean steamship costing \$500,000, at \$25,000. The English tax on this is \$250. In New York city such a vessel will be assessed at about 60 per cent, on her value, just as real estate is. She will therefore pay 2 1/2 per cent on an assessment of \$800,000, or \$10,250, 42 per cent, on the average profit of \$25,000, which can safely be counted on the original investment. There are other disadvantages under which American vessels labor, growing out of the higher wages of American seamen and the special privileges given sailors by American laws; but these can be less easily estimated. Many of them would disappear under the competition of a growing marine, but the pressure of local taxation is an unvarying factor whose real influence can be fairly measured only when the ship markets of the world are open to American buyers, but which stands an unquestioned and serious bar to the growth of an American marine. I have been customary, as the Chicago Times is now doing, to urge on state legislatures a general exemption from local taxes on ocean-going steamships, but the subject is a matter which lies well within the power of congress to regulate foreign commerce. We agree with the Springfield Republican that if the federal government is to act at all to aid American shipbuilding it ought to be not by a subsidy, for which there is no excuse, but by exempting ocean vessels from local taxation. This is the usual and familiar expedient which many small town practices successfully to encourage coveted manufactures. It has every possible advantage over subsidies and in the present condition of the American marine it would exempt but little property now paying taxes.

both are indebted to Campbell who is a capitalist and has now \$50,000 to develop the Moulton. All are Kentucky men.

The triumph of the independent republicans of Pennsylvania in the matter of the senatorship is being followed by a ship war on what is known as the "Camelot" dynasty. The best men of the party, the great capitalists of the state and the best party papers are united in the righteous work, and it is said that they have the full approval of General Garfield. It looks as if the party was to be purified and elevated at last.

The situation of the Boers with reference to Great Britain is not unlike that of America a hundred years ago, and their cause is the same. It is a fight for liberty. A boy out of England will regard the lot of the Boers and many Englishmen will regard the lot of the Boers as a graceful illustration of the Boers.

NEW TO-DAY.

Columbian Express Company No. 4-10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Highland Book and Stationery Co. No. 1-10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. Andrew A. Smith, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts. Verden, N. J.

Mr. J. H. Chandler, No. 10, 10 and 12-14th Sts.

Dissolution Sale.
THE ENTIRE STOCK OF
Franklin Bros. & Co.
Will be Sold,
REGARDLESS OF COST
FOR THE NEXT 30 DAYS.
(CONT.)
Dry and Fancy Goods

CLOAKS, DOLMANS, SHAWLS, BLANKETS,
 BOOTS AND SHOES,
 LADIES' AND GENTS' FURNISHING GOODS,
 ETC. ETC. ETC.
 N. B. — A full line of BLACK SILK CASHMERE and VELVET
 GOODS will be sold at a sacrifice. Call and be convinced.
L. HARMOI,
 SUCCESSOR TO FRANKLIN BROS. & CO
 125 First St., next to First National Bank.

CARPETS
 Antique

Shindler & Chadbourne
MANUFACTURERS OF FURNITURE.

Constantly have in stock a large assortment of
PATENTED WORK. LOUNGES, all styles and prices, upholster
in Reys, Raw and Sued Silk. Cashmeres, Silk and Wool Goods.
The **HONEY PATENT BED LOUGE,** best Bed Lounge ever invented.
166 FIRST AND 167 FRONT STREETS.

CUTTING AND FITTING a Specialty.

FIRST-CLASS DRESS & CLOAK MAKING

MRS. VAN WINKLE,

171 Fourth St., cor. of Yamhill.

(Opposite Turner Hall.)

PERFECT FIT GUARANTEED

Don't forget the Fashionable Dressmaker,
Mrs. Van Winkle, Opposite Turner Hall.

COMMISSION MERCHANTS.

DR. PAUL M. BRENA

DR. PAUL M. BRENA

The Most Successful Physician on

D. BOIS & KING,
WHOLESALE GROCERS,
**SHIPPING AND COMMISSION
MERCHANTS,**
112 and 114 Front Street, Portland, Or.
416 Battery St., San Francisco.

Special attention given to the sale of Wool, Grain
Flour and Produce in Portland and San Francisco.

R. C. JANION & CO'Y,
IMPORTERS
AND
Commission Merchants
AGENTS FOR LLOYD'S.

OFFER FOR SALE AT WHOLESALE PRICES
Ind Cooper's and Tennant's Ales, Guinness Pig
and Stout, Red Horse Brand, in bulk
Scott Whisky, in cases and bott. Duval and
other Irish Whiskies, Java, Ruby, Brandy, &c.

The Great English Remedy

and bark, Dorville Hennessy and Marcell. Cris-
DO., Porters and King's Champagnes. Ex-
hibitions and Fort. Bourdon's Claret. Jarrett's
wines. Excellent cuts of St. Vincent. Pures and
Purcell, a Table Salt. Noble's & Hoare's &
Purcell, Wheat Sacks and Hosiery. Soda & Bone
Portland Cement and Fire Bricks. White Cry-
stals, etc. etc.

JAMES H. KOONTZ,
CHATELLA, OR.
**FORWARDING AND COMMISSION
MERCHANT.**
RATES REDUCED
A Large Fire-Proof Warehouse for Storage
ALSO DEALER IN
Dry Goods, Clothing, Groceries, Hard-
ware and General Merchandise.
(Established in 1873)
627 Main Street, Astoria, O.
JAMES H. KOONTZ

JOHN R. FOSTER & CO.,
CHATELLA,
FORWARDING AND COMMISSION

FORWARDING THE CHINESE MERCHANTS,

DEALERS IN

Dry Goods, Clothing, Groceries.

WARE,

GENERAL MERCHANDISE.

Mark Goods of R. F. L. JOHN H. FOSTER & CO

ON CHUNG WA CO.,

DEALERS IN

Chinese Fancy Goods, Groceries and Provisions, and CONTRACTORS FOR CHINESE LABOR

Cor Second and Alder Sts., Portland, Or.

Callida

NOT A DRUG

HOZEY-GEN

DISEASES OF THE STOMACH AND BOWELS, Indigestion, Constipation, Bile, Dyspepsia, Catarrh, Diarrhoea, Hemorrhoids, Flatulency, Nausea, Vomiting, Chills, and Nervous Disorders, are cured by the use of HOZEY-GEN. It is a pleasant, safe, and reliable remedy, and is sold by all druggists. It is a valuable remedy for all the above diseases, and is sold by all druggists. It is a valuable remedy for all the above diseases, and is sold by all druggists.

ALBINA STEAM FERRY

THE NEW AND SUBSTANTIAL STEAM FERRY, ALBINA, WILL DEPART TWICE A WEEK, ON MONDAY AND FRIDAY, BETWEEN ALBINA AND THE CITY OF PORTLAND, ME. (CITY) 2000. FR. ALBINA 1891

NEWSPAPER ARCHIVE

